DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 177 385 CG 013 807

TITLE Drug Abuse in the New York City Schools. A Report of the Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control, House of Representatives, Ninety-Fifth Congress, Second Session (August 30-September 1, 1978).
INSTITUTION Congress of the U.S., Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE 30 Aug 78
NOTE 22p.; Best copy available

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Attendance; Criminal Law; *Drug Abuse; Elementary Secondary Education; *Marihuana; Police School Relationship; Public Schools; *School Administration; *Urban Youth
IDENTIFIERS *New York (New York)

ABSTRACT

The January 1977 hearing by the U.S. House Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control mandated three days of further hearings in 1978. The focus was upon New York city schools, but reflected many similar situations in other urban school systems according to the committee's judgement. The committee also found that alcohol and marihuana usage (the "soft drugs") have become a recent trend, while PCP usage also made strong inroads; marihuana decriminalization was misconstrued as legalization; absenteeism was correlated with drug abuse; administrative control and awareness of the extent of absenteeism was lacking although state and federal aid were jeopardized by such absenteeism; re-entry of hardcore absentees was not attempted; drug intervention programs lacked standardization; teachers needed drug training; NIDA educational material was considered "virtually useless;" school administrators, drug program directors, and law enforcement officials failed to cooperate; drug activity and violence went unreported to avoid the appearance of poor management; security needed bolstering; no federal aid came directly to the school system for drug programs; the police failed to consider the problem in school serious because of the lack of reporting by the school system. The committee's recommendations are attached. (LS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

CG

[COMMITTEE PRINT]

95TH CONGRESS
2d Session
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

DRUG ABUSE IN THE NEW YORK CITY SCHOOLS

August 30, 31, September 1, 1978

A REPORT

OF THE

SELECT COMMITTEE ON NARCOTICS ABUSE AND CONTROL

NINETY-FIFTH CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

SCNAC-95-2-23

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Printed for the use of the
Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
40-313 WASHINGTON : 1978

ED177385

CG013807

SELECT COMMITTEE ON NARCOTICS ABUSE AND CONTROL

LESTER L. WOLFF, New York, *Chairman*

PETER W. RODINO, Jr., New Jersey
PAUL G. ROGERS, Florida
E (KIKA) DE LA GARZA, Texas
JAMES R. MANN, South Carolina
MORGAN F. MURPHY, Illinois
CHARLES B. RANGEL, New York
FORTNEY H. (PETE) STARK, California
GLENN ENGLISH, Oklahoma
BILLY L. EVANS, Georgia
LEO C. ZEFERETTI, New York
DANIEL K. AKAKA, Hawaii

J. HERBERT BURKE, Florida
TOM RAILSBACK, Illinois
LOUIS FREY, Jr., Florida
ROBIN L. BEARD, Tennessee
BENJAMIN A. GILMAN, New York
TENNYSON GUYER, Ohio

Ex Officio

MARIO BIAGGI, New York
CARDISS COLLINS, Illinois
STEPHEN L. NEAL, North Carolina
JOE SKUBITZ, Kansas
DANTE B. FASCELL, Florida
ROBERT K. DORNAN, California
LINDY BOGGS, Louisiana
BARBARA A. MIKULSKI, Maryland
PATRICIA SCHROEDER, Colorado

COMMITTEE STAFF

WILLIAM G. LAWRENCE, *Chief of Staff*
JACK PEPLOE, *Investigator*
ALMA BACHRACH, *Investigator*
DOREEN THOMPSON, *Staff Counsel*
THOMAS MACKELL, *Special Counsel*

(II)

CONTENTS

	Page
Introduction	1
The investigation	2
Summary of testimony—August 30, 1978	3
Summary of testimony—August 31, 1978	5
Summary of testimony—September 1, 1978	10
Committee findings	15
Committee recommendations	16

BLANK PAGE DO NOT RUN

INTRODUCTION

In January 1977, the committee initiated an investigation into the incidence of drug abuse in the New York City schools. First reports indicated an increasing degree of drug abuse, vandalism, and related absenteeism. Pursuant to its mandate, set forth in House Resolution 77, 95th Congress, 1st session (1977), that the Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control conduct a continuous, comprehensive study and review of the problems on narcotic abuse and control, the committee held 3 days of public hearings on August 30, 31, and September 1, 1978. These hearings were held so that an attempt could be made to identify the magnitude of the problem and the possibility of finding some solutions.

To put the problem in perspective, a breakdown of student enrollment in the five boroughs is given below:

Manhattan	174,496
Bronx	225,365
Brooklyn	387,847
Queens	232,712
Staten Island	58,584
Total[1]	1,099,004

[1] Information obtained from letter received from New York City Board of Education, Bureau of Attendance, dated December 13, 1977.

There are approximately 900 schools in the New York City school system, as follows:

Elementary and Junior High	817
High School	83

The Bureau of Attendance provided statistics relating to absenteeism. Figures indicate there are approximately 200,000 students absent from school every day. Of this number, 80,000 are considered hardcore truants. The Bureau of Attendance describes a hardcore truant as: "One who has stayed away from school 50 days or more in a school year."

It should be noted here that there is no known procedure in the New York City school system to check for actual attendance in classes. It was brought out during the hearing that very little if any attempt is made to check on the students cutting classes. The definition of "cutting" is: Students who go to school, and are then marked "present" in their homeroom, and then fail to attend classes after being so marked. This then makes the 200,000 absentee figure a fallacy. In truth, the figure for that number attending school should be much lower.

The hearing also tried to determine the correlation between absenteeism and drug abuse, and to bring to light the significant financial loss suffered by the New York City school system. The deputy chancellor's office reports absenteeism represents a loss in aid of $4 a day per student. The financial crisis being experienced in New York City makes the following statistic startling: $4 per day multiplied by 200,000

absent students equals $800,000 loss per day for 184 school days. This represents a loss in the neighborhood of $147,200,000 per year.

During the course of the interviews conducted in New York City, the committee was able to collect a significant amount of information regarding present paterns of drug abuse in the city's school system. As a result of the information obtained by staff investigators if was possible for the committee to estimate the major substances of abuse by the school age population, in their order of preference, to be: Marihuana; alcohol; pills (both stimulants and depressants); cocaine; and hallucinogens. It should also be noted that phencyclidine (PCP—"angel dust") was rapidly gaining in popularity, and by now ranks just behind marihuana and alcohol in student's preference. Heroin, which at one time ranked at the top of the student's preference list, now is considered by the great majority of the youths attending the New York City schools as being socially unacceptable to them, although its use is somewhat more prevalent by those individuals lost to the school system.

Because of the decentralization of the New York City School Board there is no standardized drug intervention program in existence among the 32 community school districts. As a result, each district develops its own program for approval by the local community board.

The problem of security was addressed during the 3 days of hearings. In many cases, it was quite apparent that the physical safety of both students and teachers was in jeopardy because of incompetent personnel working for the security division of the New York school system.

During the 3 days of hearings, the committee received testimony from city and State officials in the fields of education, law enforcement, and drug abuse services. In addition, we heard from members of the community dedicated to the welfare of the youth in their area. This group was asked to address the issues pertaining to the identification and treatment of drug users, and abusers, and any programs focused on prevention.

THE INVESTIGATION

Testimony was given by staff investigator Jack Peploe and special counsel Thomas Mackell. They testified to interviewing school personnel, both professional and nonprofessional, students in the elementary, junior, and senior high schools in addition to making many onsite inspections of school properties. From these interviews, they were able to estimate the major substances of abuse by school-age population in their order of preference to be: marihuana, alcohol, pills (both stimulants and depressants), cocaine, and hallucinogens. They also noted that approximately 1 year ago, PCP was rapidly gaining in popularity and by now rates just behind marihuana and alcohol. In addition, this survey showed that heroin use had become socially unacceptable to the majority of the students. However, its use may be more prevalent by those individuals considered hardcore absentees.

Investigation disclosed that because of the decentralization of the New York City School Board, there is no standard drug intervention program in existence among the community school districts. As a result, each district develops its own programs for approval by each

local school board. The high school drug program SPARK (School Prevention of Addictions through Rehabilitation and Knowledge) which was developed and run by the Central School Board of Education under the direction of Arthur Jaffe, was felt to be the best available program in the area. In fact, SPARK is being used by many school districts throughout the Nation as one of the best examples of a drug intervention program. The only criticism of this program might be that by the time a student is involved he may have been in the drug culture too long for any program to help him. It is suggested that it would be more valuable if there were similar programs established in the elementary and junior high schools, so that a user or a potential user could be identified earlier. In this way, personnel of SPARK at the high school level could immediately begin to integrate this young person into their program.

Another problem encountered was the one of the teacher untrained in drug identification. Because the teacher is unable to recognize the drug-troubled youngster, frequently he/she will act in a negative and harmful manner. He or she either tries to ignore the student's use of drugs or adopts a hard, intemperate attitude in trying to prevent its use.

In the area of security, it is felt that many of the schools no longer perform their basic function of teaching because the halls, restrooms, and school grounds are overrun by young hoodlums. It is believed the effective teacher now finds himself in the role of the enforcer, defender of the weak, prosecutor, and beat cop. Consequently this interferes with the basic educational responsibility for teaching. It is felt that the average school guard is quite ineffective, and that a complete review of the hiring and training of this group should be one of the highest priorities of the new chancellor.

It was also substantiated by onsite observations and many interviews that children are roaming the streets of New York City without the knowledge and apparently very little concern on the part of city officials, the Board of Education, and the many agencies which should impact on the lives of these youngsters.

In a letter received by the committee from Judge Joseph B. Williams, Administrative Judge of the Family Court, he expressed concern with the lack of coordination between his court and the Board of Education in dealing with troubled youngsters.

In addition to the high, average daily absenteeism, the investigation brought to light a group of students who do show up for homeroom class to sign in, and then fail to show for the remaining part of the day. This very substantial group of students is the primary cause of many of the disruptive incidents which occur in the school halls, restrooms and school grounds. The inability of the attendance teachers and the security forces to control this situation only adds to the frustration and problems of the conscientious school teacher. This raises a question of the validity of the Board of Education's figures of full-time students for the purpose of Federal/State funding.

SUMMARY OF TESTIMONY—AUGUST 30, 1978

After hearing the sworn testimony of both the special counsel and the investigator, and the comments by Congressman F. Richmond,

(14th Congressional District, New York) wherein he expressed his concern and the concern of the New York State congressional delegation over the problem of drugs in the school, the committee heard from Daniel F. Klepak, director of the State of New York Division of Substance Abuse Services.

Commissioner Klepak testified that through legislation introduced by Governor Carey, a Commission of Alcohol and Substance Abuse Prevention and Education was created on April 1, 1978. This Commission's activities are aimed entirely at the problems with which this committee is concerned. Although the Commission had only been functioning less than 6 months, it had started work with the State Department of Education in developing a revised health education curriculum which will concentrate on substance abuse. It has also joined alcoholism and substance abuse prevention programs into an integrated attack on the problems of polydrug abuse. In direct line with this committee's thrust, it has also launched an evaluation of school-based programs in New York City and initiated a comprehensive prevention and education program throughout the State with primary emphasis on the most vulnerable targets—our young people.

Commissioner Klepak in his statement requested that the committee use its influence with other Members of Congress to see that the major portion of Federal appropriations for drug abuse programs be channeled toward prevention and intervention education. "Certainly treatment is important," he stated, "however, regardless of the importance of treatment and rehabilitation, funds for prevention must be a major portion of Federal appropriations if we are to really have a significant impact on the spread of this plague."

Just prior to this hearing, the New York State Division of Substance Abuse Services released a survey of secondary school students throughout the State. The results, which represent the latest information on drug abuse among children 12 to 17 years of age, are summarized as follows:

330,000, or over 50 percent, have used marihuana;
About 120,000, or over 20 percent, have used PCP (Phencyclidine);
Over 80,000—14 percent—have used cocaine, hashish, amphetamines and inhalants such as glue or solvents;
Over 50,000—8 percent—have used sedatives, tranquilizers, cough medicine, or other narcotics;
And 40,000, or 5 percent have used hallucinogens.

The commissioner also stated that marihuana use in the State was "almost twice as much" as in the rest of the Nation and that the polydrug abuse and misuse of prescription drugs were also causing his agency much concern. Commissioner Klepak ended his testimony by declaring, "You are not going to make schools effective in drug education or alcohol unless they also are effective in teaching reading and citizenship, etc."

The last witness for the day was Mr. Sterling Johnson, special narcotics prosecutor for New York City. Mr. Johnson's credentials were very impressive. He completed his college education while working for the New York City Police Department, and later became an assistant U.S. attorney and also served as special counsel for the Watergate Committee.

Mr. Johnson testified that the New York State Drug Law, known as the "Rockefeller Drug Laws" were not working as they had predicted they would. Mr. Johnson stated, "I venture to say that there are probably more drug addicts today than when the drug law was passed." The one thing the new drug laws have done, according to the special prosecutor, was to start a new industry and that as many youngsters are now being hired by drug dealers as carriers. Since the law does not apply to persons below the age of 16, dealers are paying from $500 to $1,000 weekly for them just to hold their supply. Mr. Johnson also stated, "If you have kids who are unemployed and underemployed and can't get jobs, and if someone is going to offer you $500 a week or $1,000 a week, you will take it. . . . The most popular hero in Harlem, Bed-Sty, and South Bronx is the successful drug pusher."

He also complained about the lack of cooperation from school authorities, in particular, the lack of reports from the administrators pertaining to the use and trafficking in the schools under their authority:

> They should be mandated to report drug incidents to somebody somewhere. The way it is handled right now, each principal handles his own problems, and each principal, if he has a drug problem in his school, tries to solve it himself, because if you have too much of a problem, then you are viewed from the Board down at Livingston Street as being a bad administrator, so therefore, no one has a drug problem.

When queried about the relationship of violence to the drug industry, the special prosecutor stated, "I term violence an allied industry of the drug traffic." He then gave the committee actual examples where children, some as young as 13 and 14 years old, have been arrested as "hit men." Mr. Johnson concluded his testimony by stating that he felt that the "commitment to the drug problem in this country is not top priority."

SUMMARY OF TESTIMONY—AUGUST 31, 1978

The second day of hearings began with a statement from Chairman Wolff which stated in part:

> Our primary objective here is to look into the situation that exists to find out exactly the parameters of the problem and determine the steps that are being taken by the schools, by the Board of Education Department as to its response to the extent of the problem. Our objective is not to point fingers at any agency of government. Our objective is not to attempt to find fault, but to find solutions to the problems.

He then swore in the first witness of the day, Captain Francis A. Daly, commanding officer of the New York City Youth Aid Division, New York City Police Department.

The Youth Aid Division in the New York City Police Department deals with complaints concerning juveniles. Some 26,000 New York City juveniles committed misdemeanors during 1977, but were not arrested and brought into court. The Youth Aid Division investigates to determine whether the child is a potential delinquent or will have further involvement in crime. If they feel there is a need to refer the child to some social agency in the city, the division will do that. In the event the child has committed a felony, then he is arrested and brought to court. Very few of this division's complaints deal with narcotic violations. Captain Daly also noted that the new State law in

40-313—79——2

New York pertaining to marihuana possession states that one must possess 16 ounces or more of marihuana to constitute a felony charge.

Captain Daly testified that the New York City Police Department feels that "schools are a small part of our overall drug abuse." The reason given for this attitude was because in the first half of this year they only received a total of 185 complaints of drug abuse from the school system. Captain Daly readily admitted that the police department was probably not getting all the complaints. Relative to the police department liaison with the schools, the captain stated that the narcotics division sergeants were responsible for keeping in touch with the schools in their assigned area and to respond to complaints from the school personnel. Each sergeant commands from 10 to 15 narcotic investigators.

It is not the policy of the New York Police Department to assign police officers inside the city schools—one exception, according to Captain Daly were 10 members of the department on permanent assignment for the school year 1977–78—5 located in the borough of Brooklyn and 5 in the Bronx Borough. The decision to assign these officers was made at the local precinct level based on the conditions existing at each school. "Conditions requiring these assignments varied, but were considered serious enough to warrant the assignment," Captain Daly stated.

When questioned about the use of youngsters as professional enforcers and carriers by drug dealers, Captain Daly felt that the New York State Legislature had taken care of that situation this year by passing laws that dealt specifically with youngsters who commit serious crimes. It was the captain's belief that New York State was the only State where a child could get life imprisonment for committing a second degree murder or manslaughter.

Captain Daly agreed with the previous day's testimony concerning the ineffectiveness of the "Rockefeller Drug Laws." He emphasized that "Truancy is a beginning sign of a juvenile who is starting to have trouble. He is beginning to rebel against our laws and our society when he starts truancy from schools."

The captain also revealed that the department has guidelines concerning the presence of police officers on school properties. Police officers do not go in to make investigations. If the officer has grounds for an arrest, he is instructed to go to the principal's office and inform him about what he has and the principal will get the student and bring him to the office where the officer will then place the student under arrest.

The next panel appearing before the members consisted of four representatives of the community school district drug programs. Ms. Audrey Sarner, narcotic coordinator of community school district No. 26 (Queens Borough); Ivan Hodge, executive director of SCANT (School Community Action for a New Tomorrow) district No. 4 (Manhattan Borough); Frank Landrow, director of substance abuse education, community school district No. 15 (Brooklyn Borough); and Levander Lilly, director, Reach Out/Drug Education program, community school district No. 19 (Brooklyn Borough).

Ms. Sarner stated that "within the school system, more than half the student population is presently either experimenting with, using, or abusing a wide variety of drugs, including marihuana, alcohol, bar-

biturates, amphetamines, PCP and narcotics." Ms. Sarner continued by stating that, "Although we are not winning the battle at the moment, we are no longer completely losing it." She felt also that the professionals who are working in the field of drug education, intervention, and prevention are unable to reach a peak of efficiency due to the lack of adequate funding, which will not allow these dedicated workers to reach their productivity level. She emphasized in her statement that the city and Federal Government do not contribute funds to schools for drug education, prevention, or intervention programs, which is now provided by the State.

In Mr. Levander Lilly's testimony, he revealed that his district (No. 19) has a student population of approximately 26,505 students attending 28 schools. The students range in age from preschool; age 4, to intermediate and junior high school; age 14 to 15. The ethnic distribution in his district is 54.5 percent black; 35.6 percent Spanish-surnamed and 9.6 percent other. Mr. Lilly also stated that according to the Bureau of Attendance office 50 percent of all students entering the New York City high schools do not graduate. In his district (No. 19) it is estimated that 70 to 75 percent of the students drop out before they complete high school. Mr. Lilly continued that many of the young people experiencing drug and alcohol problems are the same children experiencing educational difficulties, family, peer-relationship and health problems. Mr. Lilly's drug prevention program, because of inadequate funding is at present providing direct services to 14 of the 28 schools in his district, which includes all 6 intermediate and junior high schools and 9 elementary schools. The other elementary schools are provided services on an as-needed basis.

Testimony was then given by Mr. Frank Landrow. He began by stating that, "We are a drug-oriented society, . . . half of our population drinks, and 5 percent of our population is addicted to alcohol." It was also his feeling that drug abuse should not be dealt with as a problem, but as a symptom. Mr. Landrow continued by saying, "Substance abuse is a mental health problem, and I think that it should be primarily dealt with in that way." and, "You can no longer separate alcohol and substance abuse, nor can we key or should we key on a particular drug of abuse."

Mr. Landrow felt the New York City schools now have a system which can deal with the problem of drugs. "Every community and school district in New York City, in the high schools, have people in their program who are trained to deal with the problem. The fact is we need more people, we need more training."

Final testimony from the panel came from Ivan Hodge. He emphasized that "Money is a big problem. You cannot take care of a drug problem in this city and continue having 50-percent reduction as far as money allocation in districts such as mine where people who used to be paraprofessionals, who went to school for teaching no longer have their teaching jobs." Mr. Hodge also stated, "I think at times we overlook the fact that children are human. They think and they internalize certain things and they have certain frustrations and they see certain discrepancies in our policies and they rebel."

Discussion then began with the panel and the members present concerning the reasons for the failure on their part to notify the Department of Health of individual youngsters from their district who are

abusing and using drugs. The New York City law mandates that this should be done and the panel was reminded of this mandate by the special counsel. All the panel members admitted that they knew of the mandate, but each agreed that they had not for years abided by this law. They basically replied that the listing that was required by law could harm these youngsters in years to come and since there was an area of confidentiality in their programs, they felt that in good conscience, they could not obey the mandate.

The third panel contained Mr. Thomas White, (a former addict) now executive director of J-CAP, from Jamaica, Queens, and Mr. Edmund Menken, vice president of Project RETURN of New York City. Mr. White explained to the panel that J-CAP (Jamaica-Community Adolescent Program) contains an adolescent program which encompasses all of southeast Queens, and in particular, the Jamaica area. It is a residential program and also has an ambulatory program. The ambulatory services 75 youngsters and the residential 66 more. When asked by Chairman Wolff, why his program wasn't larger, Mr. White replied, "I could probably accommodate more people, however, I think that growth and quality of service delivered has to be done in such a manner to where money does not become the only criteria." Mr. White also stated:

> It (drug abuse) has reached epidemic proportions—a crisis situation extending outside of our schools as well. . . . As an administrator of a community based ambulatory and residential drug-free treatment program primarily servicing school-aged adolescents, I am confronted with our program's reason for existence on a daily basis. . . . we tell our youngsters "Don't use drugs," yet we, as responsible adults have decriminalized the use of marihuana. We tend to condone the use and abuse of alcohol among youths as the lesser of two evils, when in fact the abuse of this substance is as devastating and far-reaching as that of other drugs.

He continued:

> The need for referrals often go unattended. Statistical information is often misleading and difficult to obtain from the schools regarding drug related factors. . . . I would say that the schools are our greatest resources in terms of treating youngsters that can be identified, however, there is an attitude, I believe on the part of many, not all, school administrators to give the teacher's the wherewithal to identify and to refer those youngsters only because they are in fear that that kind of information might lessen the credibility of that individual school or their ability to administer the program.

In answer to the committee's inquiry of his opinion whether or not the identity of the young drug abuser should be on record, Mr. White replied:

> I think that I would have to identify that youngster, because you know it is only a matter of time before that individual is going to identify himself. . . . I speak from experience, that some point in time abusing anything for any long period of time after a while, the fun leaves and dependency begins.

Mr. Edmund Menken, vice president of Project RETURN one of the largest drug treatment foundations in the United States stated that his organization was forced to go out of the adolescent treatment programs, because:

> The State and Federal Government do not provide enough money to treat adolescents in the way we feel provides quality care. The satisfactory and necessary level of service both direct and supportive. And we decided somewhere along the line that we would have to go somewhere else in order to fulfill our commitment to young people. . . . As of July first we are the only drug abuse treatment agency in the city that has a license to operate what is called a child care

institution. It is essentially a foster care program. . . . It is a 60-bed facility. We are now getting approximately $52 a day per child. . . . It is quite different from the $14 a day allowance that the Federal formula provides for and which the State is bound by for residential care.

Mr. Menken bemoaned the fact that it was necessary for a legitimate drug treatment organization to resort to "going the tricky route," but in the interest of those young people placed in their charge, his organization felt they had no other choice. He appealed to the committee to investigate and help bring up to date the rules and regulations guiding the care and welfare of young people in drug treatment and rehabilitation programs throughout the country. Both Mr. Menken and Mr. White informed the committee that one of the biggest problems is the lack of credibility for authority figures by adolescence.

In the afternoon, a panel consisted of Philip Kaplan, president of the New York City School Board Association, and Marjorie Matthews, who serves as a member of community school board No. 16, and as an officer of the New York City Board Association.

Mr. Kaplan informed the members of the committee that the city of New York has 32 decentralized school districts. School board members for each district are locally elected and are not salaried. These members have the responsibility of running and controlling elementary and junior high schools in their district. It is important to note the local boards have no control over high schools in their district. The control of high schools comes directly under the Central Board of Education. Mr. Kaplan's association represents 28 of the 32 community school boards. Mr. Kaplan informed the members that only one district, to his knowledge receives some form of Federal aid for education and prevention, the rest are maintained by State funding.

Chairman Wolff asked why the local school boards did not report the names of youngsters involved in drug abuse in the schools to the Department of Health. Mr. Kaplan replied:

. . . I must say that the rationale behind it is probably to protect the students. As far as identification purposes, every school board is a separate legal entity and in each of our districts we do what is best for our community. I think if I were in the decision making process, I would tell my board not to do it either.

Mr. Kaplan cited his district (No. 15) as a typical one. It is located in Brooklyn and the approximately 24,000 students attending elementary and junior high school. The district receives approximately $40 million to run the education programs. Aside from these funds the State provides around $350,000 for a drug program. This amount is only enough for the district to service 11 out of 25 schools. In the 11 schools, there is a drug coordinator, the remaining 14 schools must depend on the principals and their staffs for service in drug-related areas. Each month, the district drug coordinator meets with these 14 schools and checks with the principals to see if there is a problem and then responds to it.

When asked by Special Counsel Mackell if putting pressure on parents of chronic truants might help speed the students' return to the classroom, Mr. Kaplan replied:

I believe that students do not come to school because parents are not interested. . . . Schools turn off the children.' . . . We are doing something wrong. . . . We turn them off, when I say we, I say the educational system turns them off, you people turn them off. . . . We are all responsible.

Mrs. Matthews stated that she had been involved in school-based programs in New York City since November 1970. She informed the committee that in her opinion, if anyone was to blame because drug abuse programs were not doing the job they should, it was not the fault of the staffs operating in the school districts. The blame should be cast on the operation of the now defunct Addiction Services Agency. She charged that:

Under the direction of several commissioners, the last one being Jerome Hornglass, we were at the whim of him and members of his staff. We found constantly from day to day or month to month the guidelines were changed . . . We never had a true evaluation of these programs.

In addition she stated:

I want you to understand we are working with something else. We are also working with staffs in schools and I'm talking from the principals on down, we are working with people who are very much against what they call the "drug scene" either against it or don't understand it.

Mrs. Matthews replied to the question of why the school boards did not require the reporting of youths' names to the Department of Health by saying:

. . . when it comes to what you are saying about reporting youngsters, I know what you are referring to. That is the Narcotic Register of the city. We felt very strongly that this could work against a youngster in years to come . . . We felt there was no confidentiality and we felt that we could not penalize our youngsters at such an early age.

Chairman Wolff ended the day's hearings by stating:

Our objective is to again, not single New York City out by any means, but indicate as you have in your testimony that we do have the largest adult addict population here. We do not want to perpetuate that by having a continually rising juvenile population that is in the abuse area.

SUMMARY OF TESTIMONY—SEPTEMBER 1, 1978

The Chairman swore in the first panel of the day consisting of Mr. Arthur Jaffe, in his capacity as director of SPARK, and as the spokesman for Mr. F. Macchiarola, chancellor of the New York City school system. In addition, Ms. Louise Latty, assistant to the chancellor; Mr. Rudolph Callender, director of Bureau of Attendance; and Mr. Carlton Irish, director of School Safety and Security, were sworn in.

Ms. Latty read Chancellor Macchiarola's statement. Ms. Latty, prior to becoming the chancellor's assistant, was a former superintendent of District No. 17, which is located in the Crown Heights-Flatbush section of the Borough of Brooklyn.

Chancellor Macchiarola's statement in part said,

I do have the authority to implement a wide range of institutional reforms which can provide children with a reason to approach their own education with higher expectation. . . . Drugs and alcohol abuse among school age children is one of the most troubling social problems facing our educational system. Responding to this hearing's thrust on absenteeism and school safety, he stated, One of my first actions as chancellor was to establish a task force on attendance to prepare reports on the issue of attendance, truancy and drug abuse. . . . I have also ordered a thorough examination of the Office of School Safety with the design of an effective reporting system and to upgrade the present capabilities of its personnel through comprehensive training.

In conclusion, the chancellor's statement stressed, "No Federal funds whatsoever are being made available to the 1 million children in our schools for extended prevention, intervention, treatment or followup."

When the committee questioned Mr. Jaffe on the lack of evaluation reports of the drug abuse programs, Mr. Jaffe stated that:

> The Board of Education, speaking for all of the 32 community school board programs as well as the SPARK program, has consistently and insistently over the past 5 years demanded that the State or city agencies responsible for these programs conduct meaningful evaluations. . . . Up until last year there was no progress in the area. Indeed the addiction service agency prior to Dr. Bihari not only did no evaluation but failed totally in providing even the most rudimentary and simple monitoring.

Mr. Jaffe said he clearly agreed with the committee's thrust for a hard evaluation of program effectiveness in order to determine levels of funding and priority.

When queried about the Narcotic Register, Mr. Jaffe replied:

> The Narcotic Register as it is now constituted is counterproductive as far as the Board of Education prevention program. Although the Board of Health has affirmed the confidential nature of these reports, feedback from the field indicates that high school youngsters do not believe that this is so, the result therefore is that whether real or imaginative this belief has stopped and will continue to stop youngsters from actively seeking our help. . . . It was felt that since the total foundation of the Register could be in serious error, we would be further compounding the error by adding names to this faulty mechanism.

When asked by the chairman to estimate a budget which would enable him to address the drug problem more effectively in the high schools of New York City, Mr. Jaffe replied approximately $5 million. This sum would represent about double their present budget. Mr. Jaffe expanded by stating that if his projection had relevance to the districts, then the budget for the entire school system would be in the area of $22 to $24 million.

The chairman asked Mr. Jaffe for his opinion on the performance and input of ASA (Addiction Service Agency) and NIDA (National Institute on Drug Abuse). Although reluctant to be quoted, Mr. Jaffe finally stated that the performance of the addiction abuse agency "ranged from criminal to incompetent." With reference to educational material provided by NIDA he stated, "The materials that they have come up with go back to some of the scare tactics of the late 60's, and we have found them to be virtually useless."

Mr. Jaffe then informed the committee that SPARK is working on a specific program that would educate the school population to the "lethal" dangers of polydrug abuse. "As part of the overall thrust we have an education program which will focus on psychological dangers that can occur if indeed you do mix let's say Quaaludes and alcohol."

In answer to questions from the members of the committee, Mr. Callender admitted that his bureau had no statistics on the number of hardcore truants that were drug addicted. In reference to his bureau's effort to apprehend the truants, Mr. Callender described his operation. "We have six attendance teachers who work city-wide in conjunction with the transit police. In 1976–77 we apprehended 10,000 children in this category. And last year we were able to apprehend 17,000." He estimated that with expanded units in Queens and other boroughs "we could apprehend double that because the children are

definitely out there." In explaining the bureau's follow-up procedure, they attempt to contact the parents.

> In many cases parents cannot be located . . . If we find at some point that we are unable to contact the parents or a relative, we then call the school and tell them that we are sending the youngster back with a note that he was apprehended on such and such and we make a referral to that community school district to followup an investigation.

Mr. Callender admitted that this system was not the best but claimed lack of staff and budget cuts gave him no alternative. The Committee felt that besides the slight incovenience to the youngster apprehended, nothing had been accomplished.

Mr. Callender informed the committee that the bureau's policy on attendance was:

> In high school the child must have attended the homeroom or the first period. If he attends for two periods he is marked present. There is some evidence that he is marked present for the whole day for State Aid purposes. . . . In the elementary school if a child is marked present and attends for an hour and a half he is marked present for the whole day and gets credit for State aid.

He added, "In our Bureau of Attendance we do not gather statistics on cutting in schools. That would be up to the principals of the various schools. That is an inschool administrative problem."

It was apparent to the committee that Mr. Irish's statements were guarded. In view of the new chancellor's statement that the Division of Safety was being re-evaluated, Mr. Irish's reluctance to comment fully was taken into consideration. Basically, Mr. Irish stated that after the initial hiring, he virtually lost control over the men assigned to him. This responsibility was taken over by the superintendents and principals of the schools to which the safety personnel were assigned. Unless the administrator of a school deemed it necessary, no reports of violence, vandalism and/or drug abuse were forwarded to the Office of School Safety and Security.

Mrs. Latty reported to the committee that there is a board of education policy that the principal is to be informed if a security officer finds a child with narcotics and then "It should be reported to the police and the parents." Mrs. Latty continued, "It is the duty of the principal to report it immediately to the police and also the child should be suspended." Mrs. Latty admitted that although this policy did exist, there was no way to tell if the principals enforced it. Chairman Wolff then asked what became of the confiscated drugs and weapons taken from the students. Mr. Irish said, "In October of 1976 I became aware of the problems in terms of contraband drugs or dangerous weapons . . . I did send a memo to all of the school principals laying out a procedure for disposing of contraband drugs and dangerous weapons."

When asked about the widespread use of PCP, Mr. Irish stated, "We read some of the reports about the widespread use of PCP and I have discussed it with Arthur (Jaffe) and frankly we don't see it in the New York City school system." When asked for his observation on the extent of the drug problems in the schools, Mr. Irish replied, "I couldn't hazard a guess." He then informed the committee there were only 700 to 800 youngsters reported to him as actually having been found with drugs in their possession. The chairman then informed Mr. Irish that the information he was giving the committee was "contrary

to the information that we have received from other sources" and indicated that Mr. Irish should take a closer look at this problem. Mr. Irish attempted to clear the last statement by saying he was only talking about activity during school hours. He continued by saying, "I certainly had no intention of extrapolating our figure to indicate that the youngsters are not using it maybe outside the school." Mr. Wolff then said, "In other words what you are saying is the fact that the trafficking doesn't take place in the schools, the abuse does not take place in the schools, but may take place around the schools." To that Mr. Irish replied, "That is correct, that is absolutely correct."

One valid point in Mr. Irish's defense of his organization is that many of his employees now come to him by way of CETA money and Mr. Irish stated:

> One of my biggest problems is that more than half of my staff are made up of CETA personnel. People hired under the Comprehensive Employment Training Act. CETA II and CETA VI. We cannot reject any CETA applicants except for cause, and when we do the interviewing, cause is that they either are drunk or that they act in such an erratic manner that anybody could see that you cannot hire them. But if it is just that you are talking to them and you say that this person is totally not suited for the kind of work that he is being interviewed for, by congressional regulations, Department of Labor, Department of Employment in New York City, we cannot reject these persons.

The last panel to appear consisted of Francis McCorry, director of drug abuse prevention programs for the New York Archdiocese; and Captain Donald White, commanding officer, narcotic unit, Nassau County Police Department. Ms. Lezette McCants, resource coordinator for the New York City Urban Coalition was the spokeswoman for the president of that organization, Mr. Arthur Barnes.

The New York City Urban Coalition does not provide direct services. They act in the capacity of brokers, conveners, mediators, and facilitators. The president of this organization, Mr. Barnes, was invited to speak in a dual capacity. As chairperson of the Governor's Advisory Council on Substance Abuse and chairperson of the New York State Task Force on Drug Abuse. The task force was convened 2 years ago to play a crucial role for the prevention and treatment community statewide: To create unity across modality lines, to lobby for continued funding and to advocate on behalf of programs.

Mr. Barnes' statement in part said,

> Prevention in any real sense can only be accomplished by viewing drug abuse as a complex human behavior. Schools have chronically failed to meet this challenge. They have failed through a refusal to consider anything except cognitive instruction as their proper province. Schools do not deal with student's concerns. The prevention programs—such as SPARK or the programs within the individual school districts with limited staffs and budgets are doing precisely what our educational system as a whole is supposed to be doing.

Mr. Barnes' statement concluded with the following recommendations:

1. The drug abuse community should continue to advocate for unity within the field, promoting the notion that the array of drug abuse services exists as a continuum which proceeds from prevention to various treatment modalities through reentry.

2. The National Institute on Drug Abuse (NIDA) should provide a greater advocacy and communication role in terms of prevention efforts.

3. Legislators must recognize that to merely maintain the annual level of funding for prevention programs is not sufficient. Inflationary trends make it impossible to maintain service delivery levels without increasing program budgets.

4. Guidelines for prevention must be sufficiently broad so that prevention programs can meet the needs of their unique populations and the particular communities which they serve. What works in Harlem may not necessarily be effective in Staten Island, what works with one child may not reach another. Programs must work closely with individual communities, assessing community resources and bringing these resources to bear upon prevention efforts.

Mr. McCorry addressing the Committee Members informed them that:

The Archdiocese and Drug Abuse Program (ADAP) is a school-based drug prevention intervention program that is currently operating in 13 Catholic high schools in the Bronx and Manhattan. There are two major components to the program. Our prevention component consists mainly of peer and theme centered groups. These groups are staffed by faculty and student volunteers who have received training in group dynamics. Our intervention components offer intensive counseling in individual group and familiar modalities to students who are regular substance abusers or experimenters. In effect our programs serve as a screening process in identifying the user most in need and getting him or her to an appropriate setting.

Mr. McCorry complained to the Committee that:

The Federal Government refuses to recognize programs such as mine as a viable and integral part of combating the problems of substance abuse among our youth. The stated priorities of NIDA have been treatment slots for addicts and I have no quarrel with the obvious need for treatment slots. My quarrel is with the Federal Government's refusal to see that prevention is really the flip side of treatment.

Captain Donald White testified that he has been the commanding officer of the Nassau County Narcotics Unit for the past 13 years:

I have seen a growth of drug abuse in Nassau County that is relative, I guess, to most of the Nation. With the intensity of the problem increasing, law enforcement is faced with the challenge of gaining the cooperation of school administrators. A change in the marihuana law in New York State has created its own problems. Interviews with students as well as adults reveal that decriminalization of small amounts was misconstrued to be legalization of the use of marihuana. Therefore the misinterpretation of the law change developed a greater acceptance of the use by both students and teachers. . . . The alarming increase of drug abuse within suburban schools has awakened some previously reluctant school administrators into cooperating with law enforcement officials. Their attitude is not shared by all. . . . By the time a school administrator finally agrees to a positive action towards violators the situation is usually so disastrous that even nonusing students are severely affected. . . . Narcotic enforcement personnel have found that nonusing students are even denied the option of using school lavatories because of drug use. Classroom activities are disrupted and the entire learning process is negated because of the widespread use of drugs within the school.

Most reasons advanced for failing to take positive action usually fall within one of the following:

Fear of creating a police atmosphere within the school.
Fear of adverse publicity.
Fear of potentially harsh punishment, relative to narcotic laws.
Fear that an arrested student may experience a lack of support by teachers.

He concluded by stating:

The solution to the problem (drug abuse) begins with the school administrators. We must kindle a positive flame or response and cooperation from supervisors. We must create and support a wholesale policy of nondrug use within the schools.

If this is maintained, then law enforcement can once more return our schools to the learning process and away from the drug culture.

After the statements were read, the committee questioned the panel. Mr. McCorry disagreed with the statements made by representatives of the New York City School Board about the abuse of PCP. Mr. McCorry stated that:

We have seen widespread use of PCP in our schools. . . . I think part of the problem with the board's statement was differentiating between within the school and use off school grounds. . . . But there is no doubt that the kids in the city, in Catholic and public schools are abusing PCP. And they are abusing it a lot.

When questioned about lack of cooperation with law enforcement officials Mr. McCorry replied:

I think there are two problems with it, one is the mutual distrust between law enforcement officials and the people in my field, the drug prevention and their purposes I think sometimes are at odds. Two is drug use or possession of drugs is viewed as a criminal act which requires a whole judicial system, whereas in the drug treatment field, possession or use is really a symptom of an underlying kind of pathology. It seems we work at odds often because the purposes are at odds.

Captain White answered by saying:

I have a job to do by State law. Very often the arrest motivates a user or somebody else into a program of help. . . . It is very hard to motivate a user who is enjoying what he is doing until either he is arrested or finally gets down to the nitty gritty of the dredges.

Captain White concluded by stating he could not understand the thinking of some school administrators:

If a student brought a loaded .38 caliber into a high school or a junior high school and ran amuck in the halls with it, I think everybody would panic, and yet we have school administrators that allow them to bring PCP, barbiturates, other kinds of pills that could be just as deadly as that .38 and they do nothing about it.

Committee Findings

1. It is the committee's considered opinion that the situation in the New York schools is not atypical, but, in fact, is indicative of a critical situation existent in all major metropolitan and suburban areas through this Nation.

2. The use of narcotics and drugs by the active students of the city of New York shows a recent tendency toward the "soft drugs," i.e., alcohol and marihuana. There is evidence that the drug known as PCP (Phencyclidine) has made strong inroads and gained in popularity among students, even though the authorities and media have forewarned them of the hazards involved with its use.

3. The decriminalization of marihuana by the New York State Legislature has created many problems for law enforcement officials and many drug program administrators. Students, as well as adults, have misconstrued the law to mean legalization. This misinterpretation of the law has created a greater acceptance of the use of marihuana by both students and teachers.

4. There is a correlation between absenteeism and drug abuse. The Bureau of Attendance in New York City has neither personnel nor the system available to cope with this massive problem. The committee found the lack of statistics in this area astounding. The admission by the director of attendance that nothing is known officially about

the practice of many students "cutting class" and his explanation that it was an "inschool administrative problem" was an unsatisfactory answer.

5. There is a question as to the legality of the New York City school system claiming Federal and State aid for students not attending for the full school day.

6. There is no standardized drug intervention program in existence among the 32 community school districts. Many of the individual community school drug programs are excellent, there are also some that leave much to be desired.

7. Little or no effort is made by any person or agency in the city of New York to insure that the 80,000-plus "hardcore" absentees re-enter the school system. In addition an effort should be made to establish if there is a correlation between absenteeism and drug abuse.

8. There is a need for educating teachers to recognize and deal with drug troubled youngsters. With proper training, this would be an additional arm of the drug prevention programs.

9. The now defunct Addiction Service Agency (ASA) was, in effect, a diversionary force instead of an agency of assistance to the local drug prevention programs. To quote Mr. Arthur Jaffe, director of SPARK, the ASA performance "ranged from criminal to incompetent."

10. The educational material provided by NIDA is considered by the professionals involved in the rehabilitation and education of drug-oriented youths in the city of New York as "virtually useless."

11. There is a lack of cooperation between school administrators and drug program directors with law enforcement officials.

12. The administrators in the school system are reluctant to report incidents of violence or drug activity in the schools. It is the consensus that these incidents are not reported because superiors would evaluate the situation as a reflection of poor management by the administrator.

13. Although there is legislation requiring school administrators to report students with a drug problem to the Department of Health, in most cases, this is not done. Administrators feel this step would discourage students from participating in a program for fear of disclosure to outside parties.

14. There is a lack of security in providing for orderly process in the New York City school system.

15. There are insufficient attendance officers to monitor students' absences from school or to produce indepth information on the magnitude of the problem.

16. There is little or no direct aid coming into the New York City school system from the Federal Government for drug education, prevention or intervention programs.

17. Primarily because of the lack of reporting from the New York City school system, the New York City Police Department does not feel the drug problem in the schools is a serious one, compared to the total city's drug problem.

Committee Recommendations

1. *Security.*—The lack of security in the New York City school system should be one of the most important items on the chancellor's

agenda. There is a real need for better trained and more highly motivated personnel in this division. If the Division of School Safety and Security is to function as a viable unit, authority to supervise its own personnel must be vested in that unit. At the present time, local principals hold this responsibility which makes for a disparate system of supervision and control.

2. *Security/CETA personnel.*—In testimony, the director of security stated that the guidelines for hiring personnel provided through CETA has created problems in his division. Namely, the New York Board of Education does not have the right to refuse to hire persons who may appear to be unqualified. The only causes for not hiring a CETA applicant are "either they are drunk or that they act in such an erratic manner that anybody could see that you cannot hire them." Because applicants will be involved in security work dealing with minors, it is felt a good character background should be a mandatory first requirement, and the applicant's ability to adapt to safety and security work should also be considered. Therefore, it is recommended that the chancellor's office meet with representatives from CETA to work out a more satisfactory agreement covering the qualifications for school security personnel.

3. *Attendance teachers.*—The Bureau of Attendance should receive assistance in the form of additional staff. A review of the office and its operational procedures also should be high on the chancellor's agenda. The inability of this office to compile statistics concerning the correlation between absenteeism and drug abuse can be partially blamed on lack of personnel.

Nevertheless, the majority of the blame must lie in the hands of the administrator of the bureau who obviously felt no need to place increased effort in this area.

In addition, the practice of "cutting class," where a student attends the homeroom class in the morning, and then fails to show up for any additional classes, should be explored and researched by this bureau, with a firm policy being adopted and regulations strictly enforced by the chancellor and his staff.

4. *Community school district drug prevention/education program.*—The austerity program in the city and State of New York results in all budget items being reviewed and revised. The committee found that the first items to be eliminated from the majority of community school district drug programs were those dealing with prevention. Districts justify the cancellation of prevention/education programs because they feel rehabilitation is most important. Nevertheless, the committee feels that the New York State Legislature should mandate a minimum prevention/education curriculum for every school district. It is recommended a program be fashioned after the successful SPARK program presently in operation in the New York City high schools.

5. *Drug orientation course for teachers.*—The National Institute on Drug Abuse (NIDA) and/or the Office of Education (OE) should provide guidelines and/or develop a course to train all teachers in major metropolitan school systems in drug identification, etc.

6. *Family court/board of education.*—There is obviously little or no coordination and cooperation between the Family Court in the city of New York and the Board of Education in dealing with juvenile prob-

lems which arise. The committee recommends that the chancellor and the administrator of the Family Court establish a liaison office so that each office has a greater awareness of the respective actions which affect youngsters within the city school system.

7. *Narcotic register.*—The New York City Department of Health instituted a system for registering all known narcotic abusers. By law, all agencies and clinics involved in drug abuse programs in the New York City area are required to report all known drug abusers to the Department of Health. The Committee noted that this ordinance has been actively opposed by the drug program directors in the New York City school system. The community school board members support this view and, in fact, have refused to comply with this ordinance. It is believed that because of the confidentiality of their work that reporting names of their charges would violate this confidence and be a detriment to the running of their rehabilitation programs.

The committee recommends that since no one is actually enforcing this ordinance, the New York City legislature should move to remove it from the books or insist upon strict enforcement of the Narcotic Register.

8. *New York State Division of Substance Abuse Services.*—The committee feels that a closer relationship should exist between the city school system and the Division of Substance Abuse Services of the State of New York. It recommends that the chancellor and his staff develop an active committee to exchange information and/or suggestions to overcome problems that might arise with the staff of the Division of Substance Abuse of New York State.

9. *Police and school administrators.*—The school administration's reluctance to report incidents of violence or drug activity in the schools creates a number of problems. Failure to report these incidents is in violation of the law. In addition, the true picture of what is occurring in the schools is not reflected. The attitude of the school administrator is, of course, projected to his subordinates. The reporting of adverse incidents is often felt to reflect on the superior's administrative ability. This intimidates the school teachers who assume that action on their part will cause them to be criticized or penalized. In this atmosphere of benign neglect the problems of violence and drug abuse go unattended, corrective steps cannot be justified, and the problems grow unchecked.

The committee recommends that the chancellor and his staff confer with the police commisioner and his staff to attempt to find a better means of communication between both agencies. The chancellor will have to insist upon the administrators of each school enforcing the laws of the State with reference to reporting all incidents of violence or drug activity. Any deviation by his administrators should be met by firm disciplinary action.

10. *Federal funding.*—During 1978, the city of New York school system received only $25,214 in direct aid from the Federal Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, for prevention. The committee recommends that the Department of Health, Education and Welfare review their funding procedures and priorities to insure survival of these programs in major metropolitan school systems.